Prepared by (TO Monitor): Reviewed by (Project Officer): Contract:		Date: "ADD" Date: "ADD"		TO Number: Evaluation Period: / / to / /			
		Title of Deliverable/ Outcome	Type of review I=Interim F=Final Product O=Ongoing	Quality	Schedule	Cost	Business Relations
1. Response	"O or F"						
2. Report (s)	"I or F"						
Average monthly rating for each performance category (To be completed by Project Officer and shared with contractor during performance discussions)							
The TO Monitor has / has not provided verbal feedback to the contractor related to the above comments. "Should provide immediate verbal feedback to the contractorso performance is recognized."							

Guidance on Performance Categories to be used in determining ratings

Quality of Product or Service

- · Compliance with contract requirements
- · Accuracy of Reports
- · Effectiveness of Personnel
- · Technical Excellence

Ratings:

- O Contractor is not in compliance and is jeopardizing achievement of contract objectives
- 1 Major problems have been encountered
- 2 Some problems have been encountered
- 3 Minor inefficiencies/ errors have been identified
- 4 Contractor is in compliance with contract requirements and/or delivers quality products/services
- 5 The contractor has demonstrated an outstanding performance level that justifies adding a point to the score.

Cost Control

- Record of forecasting and controlling target cost
- Current, accurate and complete billings
- Comparison of negotiated costs to actual expenditures
- · Costs efficiencies or deficiencies

Ratings (based on contractor self-reporting):

- O less than 70% of deliverables onbudget
- 1 70 79% of deliverables on budget
- 2 80 89% of deliverables onbudget
- 3 90-93% of deliverables on-budget
- 4 94 96% of deliverables are onbudget and no significant impact to projects due to budget overages 5 -97% or more deliverables are onbudget and no significant impact to projects due to budget overages

Timeliness of Performance

- · Met interim Milestones
- Reliability
- Completed on time, including wrap-up and contract administration
- · Met delivery schedules

Ratings (based on contractor self-reporting):

- O less than 64% of deliverables on-time
- 1 65 74% of deliverables on -time
- 2 -75 84% of deliverables on-time
- 3 85-89% of deliverables on-time
- 4 90 94% of deliverables are on-time and no significant impact to projects due to lateness
- 5 -95% or more deliverables are on-time and no significant impact to projects due to lateness

Business Relations/Management

- · Effective Management, including subcontracts
- Reasonable/cooperative behavior w/external customers
- · Responsive to contract requirements
- · Notification of problems
- Flexibility
- · Pro-active vs. reactive

Ratings:

- O Management of outcome and communications related to deliverable is not effective
- 1 Management of outcome and communications related to deliverable is marginally effective
- 2 Management of outcome and communications related to deliverable is somewhat effective
- 3 Management of outcome and communications related to deliverable is usually effective
- 4 Management of outcome and communications related to deliverable is effective
- 5 The contractor has demonstrated an outstanding performance level that justifies adding a point to the score.

Comments

Task Order Monitor	Date